arXiv:1601.06756v1 [cs.IT] 25 Jan 2016

Privacy, Secrecy, and Storage with Noisy Identifiers

Onur Günlü and Gerhard Kramer
Institute for Communications Engineering
Technical University of Munich
Email: {onur.gunlu, gerhard.kramer}@tum.de

***Abstract*—The key-leakage-storage capacity regions for a hidden identifier's noisy measurements at two terminals of a secrecy system are derived. The capacity regions of binary sources with multiple measurements are obtained by applying Mrs. Gerber's lemma twice in different directions to a Markov chain to show gains in privacy-leakage as compared to assuming a noise-free identifier at the encoder.**

I. Introduction

Biometric or physical identifiers with unique features can be used to authenticate or identify a user, or to generate secret keys for cryptographic systems. We study information-theoretic limits for using such identifiers. We consider the model introduced in [1] and [2] where two terminals observe dependent random variables and an eavesdropper observes public messages. The model has two variants. For the *generated-secret* model an encoder extracts a secret-key from the source, while for the *chosen-secret* model a secret key is embedded into the message. We consider one-round secret-key agreement, where public communication is limited to a single message called *helper data*.

The secret-key vs. privacy-leakage, or key-leakage, capacity regions for the two models are given in [3] and [4]. The storage rate is equal to the privacy-leakage rate for the generated-secret model. The two rates are different for general secrecy-leakage levels [5] unlike for the negligible secrecy-leakage rate in [3] and [4]. Gains in the achievable key-leakage rates are shown in [6] when there are multiple noisy measurements of the source at the decoder.

The above models assume that the encoder measures the "true" source. We propose that this is not the case in general. Instead, the "true" source is hidden from the encoder, i.e., the encoder measures a noisy version of the source (see also [7] where the same idea is used for authentication problems). We derive the key-leakage-storage capacity regions for this model and show that the rates improve by designing a code for the "true" model rather than the "false" one. In particular, we evaluate the capacity region for multiple measurements of a binary source by applying Mrs. Gerber's lemma (MGL) [8] twice in different directions of a Markov chain. This differs from the analysis in [3] and [6], where MGL is used once.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we describe our model and develop the capacity regions for the generated- and chosen-secret models. The key-leakage-storage capacity region of a binary source with multiple measurements at the decoder is derived in Section III. In Section IV, we illustrate the gains when using the true model and the maximum secret-key rates achieved by multiple encoder and decoder measurements. Section V concludes the paper.

II. System Models and Capacity Regions

A. Notation

Upper case letters represent random variables and lower case letters their realizations. Superscripts denote a string of variables, e.g., $X^N = X_1 \dots X_i \dots X_N$, and subscripts denote the position of a variable in a string. A random variable X has probability distribution Q_X or P_X. Calligraphic letters such as $\mathcal{X}$ denote sets; their sizes are written as $|\mathcal{X}|$ and their complements are denoted as $\mathcal{X}^c$. $\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^N(Q_X)$ denotes the set of length-N letter-typical sequences with respect to the probability distribution Q_X and the positive number ϵ [9, Ch. 3], [10]. The $*$-operator is defined as $p*\tilde{x} = p(1-\tilde{x})+(1-p)\tilde{x}$. $\text{Unif}\,[1:N]$ denotes the uniform distribution over the integers $1, 2, \dots, N$.

B. System Models

Consider a discrete memoryless source (DMS) that generates independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) symbols X^N from a finite set $\mathcal{X}$ according to the probability distribution Q_X. The outputs of the memoryless channels $P_{\widetilde{X}|X}$ and $P_{Y|X}$ are, respectively, the strings $\widetilde{X}^N$ with realizations from a finite set $\widetilde{\mathcal{X}}^N$ and Y^N with realizations from a finite set $\mathcal{Y}^N$. We thus have

$$P_{\widetilde{X}^N X^N Y^N}(\tilde{x}^N, x^N, y^N) = \prod_{i=1}^{N} P_{\widetilde{X}|X}(\tilde{x}_i|x_i) Q_X(x_i) P_{Y|X}(y_i|x_i). \quad (1)$$

In the generated-secret model depicted in Fig. 1, an encoder sees $\widetilde{X}^N$ and generates a secret key S and helper data M as $(S, M) = \mathsf{Enc}_1(\widetilde{X}^N)$, where Enc_1 is an encoder mapping. The decoder estimates the key as $\hat{S} = \mathsf{Dec}_1(Y^N, M)$, where Dec_1 is a decoder mapping. In the chosen-secret model shown in Fig. 2, S is independent of $(X^N, \widetilde{X}^N, Y^N)$ and an encoder mapping Enc_2 generates helper data as $M = \mathsf{Enc}_2(\widetilde{X}^N, S)$. The decoder estimates the key as $\hat{S} = \mathsf{Dec}_2(Y^N, M)$, where Dec_2 is a decoder mapping.

A (secret-key, privacy-leakage, storage) rate triple (R_s, R_l, R_m) is achievable if, given any $\epsilon > 0$, there is some $N \geq 1$ and an encoder and decoder for which $R_s = \dfrac{\log |\mathcal{S}|}{N}$



Fig. 1: The generated-secret model.



Fig. 2: The chosen-secret model.

and

$$\Pr[S \neq \hat{S}] \leq \epsilon \qquad (reliability) \tag{2}$$

$$\frac{1}{N} I(S; M) \leq \epsilon \qquad (secrecy) \tag{3}$$

$$\frac{1}{N} I\left(X^N; M\right) \leq R_l + \epsilon \qquad (privacy) \tag{4}$$

$$\frac{1}{N} H(S) \geq R_s - \epsilon \qquad (uniformity) \tag{5}$$

$$\frac{1}{N} H(M) \leq R_m + \epsilon. \qquad (storage) \tag{6}$$

The capacity region is the set of achievable rates. We later refer to models where $\widetilde{X}^N$ determines X^N as visible source models (VSMs) and all other cases as hidden source models (HSMs).

C. Key-leakage-storage Capacity Regions

We present the key-leakage-storage capacity regions for the generated- and chosen-secret models in Theorem 1 and Theorem 2, respectively. The proofs for the theorems are given in Appendices A-C. We prove cardinality bounds for the auxiliary random variable in Appendix D and the convexity of the rate regions in Appendix E.

Theorem 1. *The key-leakage-storage capacity region for the generated-secret model is*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_1 = \bigcup_{P_{U|\widetilde{X}}} \Big\{ & (R_s, R_l, R_m) : 0 \leq R_s \leq I(U;Y), \\ & R_l \geq I(U;X) - I(U;Y), \\ & R_m \geq I(U;\widetilde{X}) - I(U;Y) \Big\} \end{aligned} \tag{7a}$$

$$\text{where } P_{U\widetilde{X}XY} = P_{U|\widetilde{X}} \cdot P_{\widetilde{X}|X} \cdot Q_X \cdot P_{Y|X}. \tag{7b}$$

Theorem 2. *The key-leakage-storage capacity region for the chosen-secret model is*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_2 = \bigcup_{P_{U|\widetilde{X}}} \Big\{ & (R_s, R_l, R_m) : 0 \leq R_s \leq I(U;Y), \\ & R_l \geq I(U;X) - I(U;Y), \\ & R_m \geq I(U;\widetilde{X}) \Big\} \end{aligned} \tag{8a}$$

$$\text{where } P_{U\widetilde{X}XY} = P_{U|\widetilde{X}} \cdot P_{\widetilde{X}|X} \cdot Q_X \cdot P_{Y|X}. \tag{8b}$$

Remark. The Markov conditions in (7b) and (8b) state that $U - \widetilde{X} - X - Y$ forms a Markov chain. One may restrict the cardinality of U to $|\mathcal{U}| \leq |\mathcal{X}| + 2$ for both theorems. The rate regions $\mathcal{R}_1$ and $\mathcal{R}_2$ are convex.

Note that the maximum achievable secret-key rate $I(\widetilde{X}; Y)$ in these regions is at most $I(X;Y)$, which is the maximum achievable secret-key rate if the identifier X^N is observed noise-free at the encoder [3], [4].

III. Noisy Measurements From BSCs

We evaluate the capacity regions for binary sources. Suppose the encoder and the decoder see $\widetilde{X}^N$ and $Y_{1:M_D}^N = [Y_1 Y_2 \dots Y_{M_D}]^N$, respectively. The binary random sequence $\widetilde{X}^N$ corresponds to a single measurement of the binary source X^N, where the inverse channel $P_{X|\widetilde{X}}$ is a BSC and X^N need not be uniform. The random sequence $Y_{1:M_D}^N$ is the output of M_D measurements of the same source for $M_D \geq 1$ and the channel $P_{Y_{1:M_D}|X}$ can be decomposed into a mixture of BSCs as described in [6]. Evaluating the key-leakage-storage capacity regions requires maximizing $I(U; Y_{1:M_D})$ and minimizing $I(U; \widetilde{X})$ for a fixed $I(U;X)$.

We review the results from [6]. Let $u_i = P_U(i)$ for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, |\mathcal{U}|\}$. Define the function

$$g(w_i) = H(Y_{1:M_D}|U = i) \tag{9}$$

where $w_i \in [0, 0.5]$ such that

$$H(X|U) = \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{U}|} u_i H_b(w_i) \tag{10}$$

$$H(Y_{1:M_D|U}) = \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{U}|} u_i g(w_i) \tag{11}$$

where $H_b(x) = -x \log x - (1-x)\log(1-x)$ is the binary entropy function. The result in [6, Section II.B] uses MGL to establish the convexity of $g(H_b^{-1}(\nu))$ in ν and the lower bound

$$H(Y_{1:M_D}|U) \geq g\Big(H_b^{-1}\big(H(X|U)\big)\Big) \tag{12}$$

where $H_b^{-1}(x)$ is the inverse of the binary entropy function and its range is $[0, 0.5]$.



Fig. 3: Storage-leakage projection of the boundary triples for the generated-secret model with $p_D = 0.10$.



Fig. 4: Key-leakage projection of the boundary triples for both models with $p_D = 0.10$.

Theorem 3. *Suppose $P_{X|\widetilde{X}}$ is a BSC with crossover probability p and $P_{Y_{1:M_D}|X}$ is a mixture of BSCs. The boundary points of $\mathcal{R}_1$ and $\mathcal{R}_2$ are achieved by channels $P_{\widetilde{X}|U}$ that are BSCs.*

Proof: Consider the boundary points of $\mathcal{R}_1$

$$\begin{aligned}(R_s, R_l, R_m) = \Big(& I(U;Y_{1:M_D}), \\ & I(U;X) - I(U;Y_{1:M_D}), \\ & I(U;\widetilde{X}) - I(U;Y_{1:M_D}) \Big). \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Using (12) and MGL we obtain

$$I(U;Y_{1:M_D}) \le H(Y_{1:M_D}) - g\big(H_b^{-1}(H(X|U))\big), \tag{14}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & I(U;X) - I(U;Y_{1:M_D}) \\ & \ge H(X) - H(X|U) - H(Y_{1:M_D}) + g\big(H_b^{-1}(H(X|U))\big), \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & I(U;\widetilde{X}) - I(U;Y_{1:M_D}) \\ & \ge H(\widetilde{X}) - H_b\Big(\frac{H_b^{-1}(H(X|U)) - p}{1-2p}\Big) \\ & \quad - H(Y_{1:M_D}) + g\big(H_b^{-1}(H(X|U))\big). \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

By choosing $P_{U|\widetilde{X}}$ such that $P_{\widetilde{X}|U}$ is a BSC with crossover probability

$$\tilde{x} = \frac{H_b^{-1}(H(X|U)) - p}{1-2p} \tag{17}$$

we achieve the right-hand sides of (14)-(16). The proof for $\mathcal{R}_2$ is similar. ∎

IV. Examples

We study the generated-secret model with a binary symmetric source (BSS) such that $Q_X(x) = 0.5$ for $x \in \{0,1\}$. Suppose $P_{\widetilde{X}|X}$ is a BSC with crossover probability p_E and $P_{Y_{1:M_D}|X}$ consists of M_D independent BSCs with crossover probability p_D. The inverse channel $P_{X|\widetilde{X}}$ is also a BSC with crossover probability p_E due to the source symmetry. We first illustrate that the best code design when the hidden source model (HSM) is treated as if it were a visible source model (VSM) gives pessimistic privacy-leakage rate results for any M_D and over-optimistic secret-key and storage rate results for $M_D > 1$.

Consider the crossover probabilities $p_E \in \{0.03, 0.10\}$, which are realistic values for biometric [3] and physical identifiers [13]. We fix the crossover probability of $P_{Y_i|X}$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, M_D$ to $p_D = 0.10$. For the VSM, $\widetilde{X}^N$ is mistakenly considered to be a noise-free source, i.e., p_E is assumed to be 0, and the decoder-input channel $P_{Y_{1:M_D}|\widetilde{X}}$ is assumed to consist of M_D independent BSCs that are assumed to have crossover probability $p_E * p_D$. Recall that in the HSM there are independent measurements of the source at the encoder and decoder, which results in a conditional probability distribution $P_{Y_{1:M_D}|\widetilde{X}}$ different from the distribution for the VSM for $M_D > 1$.

The projections of the boundary triples (R_s, R_l, R_m) onto the (R_l, R_m)-plane for the HSM and VSM are depicted in Fig. 3, and Fig. 4 shows the projections onto the (R_l, R_s)-plane for different crossover probabilities at the encoder and different number of measurements at the decoder. At the highest leakage-storage (R_l^*, R_m^*) point in Fig. 3, one achieves the maximum secret-key rate R_s^* that corresponds to the highest point in Fig. 4.

Fig. 3 shows that for the VSM, the privacy-leakage and storage rates are equal, which are also equal to the storage-rate for the HSM if $M_D = 1$. Consider the points (R_s^*, R_l^*, R_m^*) at the ends of the curves in Fig. 3 and Fig. 4 other than the zero points. For $(p_E = 0.03, p_D = 0.10)$, the privacy-leakage rate R_l^* for the HSM is about 36% less than for the VSM if $M_D = 1$. If $M_D = 3$, the storage R_m^* and privacy-leakage R_l^* rates decrease for the HSM and VSM, and R_l^* for the HSM is less than for the VSM although the storage rate R_m^*



Fig. 5: Storage-leakage projection of (R_s^*, R_l^*, R_m^*) points for the generated-secret model with multiple encoder measurements and $p_D = 0.10$.



Fig. 6: Key-leakage projections of (R_s^*, R_l^*, R_m^*) points for the generated-secret model with multiple encoder measurements and $p_D = 0.10$.

for the HSM is greater than for the VSM. The VSM thus gives pessimistic privacy-leakage rate results. Fig. 4 shows that increasing the number of measurements at the decoder increases the maximum secret key rate R_s^* for the HSM and VSM. R_s^* for the HSM and VSM are equal if $M_D = 1$, but it is about 14% greater for the VSM than for the HSM if $M_D = 3$, $p_E = 0.03$, and $p_D = 0.10$. The VSM thus gives over-optimistic secret-key and storage rate results for $M_D > 1$. Thus, designing a code for the wrong model can lead to substantial secrecy leakage.

Fig. 3 and Fig. 4 show that increasing p_E decreases R_s^* and R_l^*, and increases R_m^* for the HSM. For instance, if we increase the crossover probability from $p_E = 0.03$ to $p_E = 0.10$ for $(p_D = 0.10, M_D = 1)$, we observe that R_s^* and R_l^* decrease, respectively, by about 30% and 39% when R_m^* increases by about 26%. More reliable encoder-input channels thus achieve better rate triples. One can, however, consider correlated measurements at the encoder and decoder unlike the independence assumption in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2. An unreliable channel at the encoder might be desirable for this case if the decoder-input is unreliable since correlations might allow less storage and leakage, and greater secret-key rates.

Consider $M_E > 1$ independent measurements $\widetilde{X}_{1:M_E}^N = [\widetilde{X}_1 \widetilde{X}_2 \dots \widetilde{X}_{M_E}]^N$ of the hidden source X^N at the encoder for the generated-secret model with the HSM. Suppose each encoder-input channel $P_{\widetilde{X}_i|X}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, M_E$ is an independent BSC with crossover probability p_E. The maximum-secret key rate R_s^* is obtained by choosing $U = \widetilde{X}_{1:M_E}$. We thus plot the projections of the (R_s^*, R_l^*, R_m^*) points onto the (R_l, R_m)- and (R_l, R_s)-planes in Fig. 5 and Fig. 6, respectively, for different number of encoder and decoder measurements with $p_D = 0.10$. Fig. 5 shows that storage rates for multiple encoder measurements can be greater than 1 bit/source-bit, which cannot be the case for a single encoder measurement. Consider, for instance, the case $(p_E = 0.03, p_D = 0.10, M_D = 3)$. If we increase the number of encoder measurements from $M_E = 1$ to 3, then R_s^*, R_l^*, and R_m^* increase by about 20%, 36%, and 145%, respectively. Increasing the number M_E of encoder measurements to increase the secret-key rate can thus come at a large cost of storage.

V. Conclusion

We derived the key-leakage-storage capacity regions for a hidden source model. For a BSS, we used MGL to evaluate the capacity regions and showed that multiple measurements at the decoder improve rates as compared to a single measurement. The privacy-leakage rates are pessimistic, whereas the secret-key and storage rates are optimistic if one mistakenly uses the visible-source model when the source is hidden. The points that achieve the maximum secret-key rates in the capacity regions for multiple encoder measurements show that increasing the secret-key rate can result in significantly greater storage rates.

Examples illustrated that improved reliability in the encoder measurements enlarge the capacity region. In future work, we will consider capacity regions for correlated measurements at the encoder and decoder, and try to show that reduced reliability in the measurements might increase the capacity region.

Acknowledgment

O. Günlü and G. Kramer were supported by an Alexander von Humboldt Professorship endowed by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research.

Appendix A
Coding for Theorem 1

A. Overview

We first provide a quick overview of the coding method before presenting the proof details. We choose the conditional

probabilities $P_{U|\widetilde{X}}(u|\tilde{x})$ for all $u\in\mathcal{U}$ and $\tilde{x}\in\widetilde{\mathcal{X}}$. We then randomly and independently generate about $2^{NI(U;\widetilde{X})}$ sequences $u^N(m,s)$ for $m=1,\ldots,2^{NR_m}$ and $s=1,\ldots,2^{NR_s}$. Consider roughly $2^{N(I(U;\widetilde{X})-I(U;Y))}$ storage labels m and $2^{NI(U;Y)}$ key labels s. The encoder finds the unique $u^N(m,s)$ sequence that is jointly typical with the observed measurement $\tilde{x}^N$ of the source x^N. It then publicly sends the storage label m to the decoder. The decoder sees another measurement y^N of the source so that it determines the unique $u^N(m,\hat{s})$ that is jointly typical with y^N. Using standard results, e.g., [14, Lemma 3.3], one can show that the error probability $\Pr[S\neq\hat{S}]\to 0$ as $N\to\infty$. The secrecy-leakage rate is negligible if there is no error. The privacy-leakage rate is roughly $I(U;X)-I(U;Y)$.

B. Proof

Random Code: Fix $P_{U|\widetilde{X}}$. Randomly and independently generate codewords $u^N(m,s)$, $m=1,\ldots,2^{NR_m}$, $s=1,\ldots,2^{NR_s}$ according to $\prod_{i=1}^N P_U(u_i)$, where

$$P_U(u_i)=\sum_{\tilde{x},x\in\widetilde{\mathcal{X}}\times\mathcal{X}} P_{U|\widetilde{X}}(u_i|\tilde{x})P_{\widetilde{X}|X}(\tilde{x}|x)Q_X(x). \quad (18)$$

These codewords define the codebook

$$\mathcal{C}=\{u^N(m,s),m=1,\ldots,2^{NR_m},s=1,\ldots,2^{NR_s}\} \quad (19)$$

and we denote the random codebook by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}=\{U^N(m,s)\}_{(m,s)=(1,1)}^{(2^{NR_m},2^{NR_s})}. \quad (20)$$

Let $0<\epsilon'<\epsilon$.

Encoding: Given $\tilde{x}^N$, the encoder looks for a codeword that is jointly typical with $\tilde{x}^N$, i.e., $(u^N(m,s),\tilde{x}^N)\in\mathcal{T}_{\epsilon'}^N(P_{U\widetilde{X}})$. If there is no such codeword or more than one such codeword, it sets $m=s=1$. The encoder publicly stores the label m.

Decoding: The decoder puts out $\hat{s}$ if there is a unique key label $\hat{s}$ that satisfies the typicality check $(u^N(m,\hat{s}),y^N)\in\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^N(P_{UY})$; otherwise, it sets $\hat{s}=1$.

Error Probability: Define the error event

$$E=\left\{(U^N(M,\hat{S}),\widetilde{X}^N,X^N,Y^N)\notin\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^N(P_{U\widetilde{X}XY})\right\}$$

and the events

$$E_1=\left\{(U^N(m,s),\widetilde{X}^N)\notin\mathcal{T}_{\epsilon'}^N(P_{U\widetilde{X}}) \text{ for all } (m,s)\in[1:2^{NR_m}]\times[1:2^{NR_s}]\right\}$$

$$E_2=\left\{(U^N(M,S),\widetilde{X}^N,X^N,Y^N)\notin\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^N(P_{U\widetilde{X}XY})\right\}$$

$$E_3=\left\{(U^N(M,s'),Y^N)\in\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^N(P_{UY}) \text{ for some } s'\neq S\right\}.$$

Using the union bound we have

$$\Pr[E]\le\Pr[E_1]+\Pr[E_1^c\cap E_2]+\Pr[E_3]. \quad (21)$$

$\Pr[E_1]$ is small with large N if

$$R_m+R_s>I(U;\widetilde{X})+\delta(\epsilon') \quad (22)$$

where $\delta(\epsilon')\to 0$ as $\epsilon'\to 0$ (see [14, Lemma 3.3]).

Note that the event $\{\widetilde{X}^N=\tilde{x}^N,U^N=u^N\}$ implies $Y^N\sim\prod_{i=1}^N P_{Y|\widetilde{X}}(y_i|\tilde{x}_i)$. By the conditional typicality lemma [14, pg. 27], we obtain $\Pr[E_1^c\cap E_2]\to 0$ as $N\to\infty$.

Due to symmetry in the code generation, we can set $M=1$ and have

$$\Pr[E_3]=\Pr[(U^N(1,s'),Y^N)\in\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^N(P_{UY}) \text{ for some } s'\neq S].$$

By [14, Lemma 3.1], we have $\Pr[E_3]\to 0$ as $N\to\infty$ if

$$R_s<I(U;Y)-\delta(\epsilon) \quad (23)$$

where $\delta(\epsilon)\to 0$ as $\epsilon\to 0$.

We define δ_1,δ_2, where $\delta_2>\delta(\epsilon)$ and $\delta_1>\delta(\epsilon')+\delta_2$, that tend to zero as $\epsilon\to 0$ and some $\delta>0$ that tends to zero as $N\to\infty$ and $\epsilon\to 0$ such that

$$\Pr[E]\le\delta \quad (24)$$

$$R_m=I(U;\widetilde{X})-I(U;Y)+\delta_1 \quad (25)$$

$$R_s=I(U;Y)-\delta_2. \quad (26)$$

We first establish bounds for the secrecy-leakage, secret-key, privacy-leakage, and storage rates averaged over the random codebook $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$, then we show that there exists a codebook satisfying (2)-(6).

Secrecy-leakage Rate: In the following, U^N represents $U^N(M,S)$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
H(MS|\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) &\overset{(a)}{=} H(U^NMS|\tilde{\mathcal{C}})\\
&\ge H(U^N|\tilde{\mathcal{C}})\\
&= H(U^N\widetilde{X}^N|\tilde{\mathcal{C}})-H(\widetilde{X}^N|U^N\tilde{\mathcal{C}})\\
&\overset{(b)}{\ge} NH(\widetilde{X})-H(\widetilde{X}^N|U^N\tilde{\mathcal{C}})\\
&\overset{(c)}{\ge} NH(\widetilde{X})-N(H(\widetilde{X}|U)+\delta_\epsilon)\\
&= N(I(U;\widetilde{X})-\delta_\epsilon)\\
&\overset{(d)}{\ge} N(R_m+R_s-\delta_1+\delta_2-\delta_\epsilon) \quad (27)
\end{aligned}$$

where

(a) follows because, given the codebook, MS determines U^N,

(b) follows because $\widetilde{X}^N$ is independent of the codebook,

(c) follows by using similar steps as in [14, Lemma 22.3] for $N\to\infty$ and $\delta_\epsilon\to 0$ as $\epsilon\to 0$,

(d) follows by (25) and (26).

Using (27) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{N}I(S;M|\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) &= \frac{1}{N}(H(S|\tilde{\mathcal{C}})+H(M|\tilde{\mathcal{C}})-H(MS|\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))\\
&\le \frac{1}{N}(NR_s+NR_m-H(MS|\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))\\
&\le \delta_1-\delta_2+\delta_\epsilon \quad (28)
\end{aligned}$$

which tends to zero as $N\to\infty$ and $\epsilon\to 0$.

Key Uniformity: We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{N}H(S|\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) &\ge \frac{1}{N}(H(MS|\tilde{\mathcal{C}})-H(M|\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))\\
&\overset{(a)}{\ge} R_s-\delta_1+\delta_2-\delta_\epsilon. \quad (29)
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows by (27).

Privacy-leakage Rate: First consider

$$\begin{aligned}
&H(M|X^N\tilde{\mathcal{C}})\\
&=H(M\widetilde{X}^N|X^N\tilde{\mathcal{C}})-H(\widetilde{X}^N|MX^N\tilde{\mathcal{C}})\\
&\overset{(a)}{\geq}H(\widetilde{X}^N|X^N)-H(\widetilde{X}^N|MX^N\tilde{\mathcal{C}})\\
&\overset{(b)}{=}H(\widetilde{X}^N|X^N)-H(\widetilde{X}^NS|MX^N\tilde{\mathcal{C}})\\
&\geq NH(\widetilde{X}|X)-H(S|MX^N\tilde{\mathcal{C}})-H(\widetilde{X}^N|X^NU^N\tilde{\mathcal{C}})\\
&\overset{(c)}{=}NH(\widetilde{X}|X)-H(S|MX^NY^N\hat{S}\tilde{\mathcal{C}})-H(\widetilde{X}^N|X^NU^N\tilde{\mathcal{C}})\\
&\overset{(d)}{\geq}NH(\widetilde{X}|X)-\Pr[E]\log|\mathcal{S}|-H_b(\Pr[E])-H(\widetilde{X}^N|X^NU^N\tilde{\mathcal{C}})\\
&\overset{(e)}{=}NH(\widetilde{X}|X)-N\delta'-H(\widetilde{X}^N|X^NU^N\tilde{\mathcal{C}})\\
&\overset{(f)}{\geq}NH(\widetilde{X}|X)-N\delta'-N(H(\widetilde{X}|XU)+\delta'_\epsilon)\\
&=N(I(U;\widetilde{X}|X)-(\delta'+\delta'_\epsilon))
\end{aligned}\tag{30}$$

where
(a) follows because $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ is independent of $\widetilde{X}^NX^N$,
(b) follows because, given the codebook, $\widetilde{X}^N$ determines S,
(c) follows by the Markov chain $SMU^N-\widetilde{X}^N-X^N-Y^N$,
(d) follows from Fano's inequality,
(e) follows by using $|\mathcal{S}|\leq|\widetilde{\mathcal{X}}|^N$ and defining a parameter δ' that tends to zero as $N\to\infty$ and $\epsilon\to 0$,
(f) follows by using similar steps as in [14, Lemma 22.3] for $N\to\infty$ and $\delta'_\epsilon\to 0$ as $\epsilon\to 0$.

Using (30) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{N}I(X^N;M|\tilde{\mathcal{C}})&=H(M|\tilde{\mathcal{C}})-H(M|X^N\tilde{\mathcal{C}})\\
&\leq R_m-(I(U;\widetilde{X}|X)-(\delta'+\delta'_\epsilon))\\
&\overset{(a)}{=}R_m-(H(U|X)-H(U|\widetilde{X})-(\delta'+\delta'_\epsilon))\\
&\overset{(b)}{=}I(U;X)-I(U;Y)+\delta'+\delta'_\epsilon
\end{aligned}\tag{31}$$

where (a) follows by the Markov chain $U-\widetilde{X}-X$, and (b) follows by (25).

Storage Rate: We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{N}H(M|\tilde{\mathcal{C}})&\leq R_m\\
&=I(U;\widetilde{X})-I(U;Y)+\delta_1.
\end{aligned}\tag{32}$$

These results show that there exists a codebook that achieves for the generated-secret model the key-leakage-storage triple

$$\begin{aligned}
(R_s,R_l,R_m)=\big(&I(U,Y),\\
&I(U;X)-I(U;Y),\\
&I(U;\widetilde{X})-I(U;Y)\big).
\end{aligned}\tag{33}$$

Appendix B
Coding for Theorem 2

A. Overview

We use the achievability proof of the generated-secret model in combination with a one-time pad to conceal the embedded secret key S by the key S' generated by the generated-secret model. The embedded key S is uniformly distributed and independent of other random variables. The secret-key and privacy-leakage rates do not change, but the storage rate $I(U;\widetilde{X})$ is roughly the sum of the storage and secret-key rates of the generated-secret model.

B. Proof

Suppose S has the same cardinality as S', i.e., $|\mathcal{S}|=|\mathcal{S}'|$. We use the codebook, encoder, and decoder of the generated-secret model and add the masking layer (one-time pad) approach of [1], [3], [15] for the chosen-secret model as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
M=\mathsf{Enc}_2(\widetilde{X}^N,S)\ &=[S'+S,M']\\
\hat{S}=\mathsf{Dec}_2(Y^N,M)&=S'+S-\hat{S}'
\end{aligned}\tag{34}$$

where the addition and subtraction operations are modulo-$|\mathcal{S}|$.

Error Probability: We have

$$\Pr[S\neq\hat{S}]=\Pr[S'\neq\hat{S}']\tag{35}$$

which is small by (24).

Secrecy-leakage Rate: The helper data M of the chosen-secret model consists of $S'+S$ and the helper data M' of the generated-secret model. We thus have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{N}I(S;M',S'+S|\tilde{\mathcal{C}})\\
&\overset{(a)}{=}\frac{1}{N}I(S;S'+S|M'\tilde{\mathcal{C}})\\
&\overset{(b)}{=}\frac{1}{N}(H(S'+S|M'\tilde{\mathcal{C}})-H(S'|M'\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))\\
&\overset{(c)}{=}\frac{1}{N}(\log|\mathcal{S}'|-H(S'|\tilde{\mathcal{C}})+I(S';M'|\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))\\
&\overset{(d)}{\leq}2(\delta_1-\delta_2+\delta_\epsilon)
\end{aligned}\tag{36}$$

where (a), (b), and (c) follow because S is independent of $S'M'\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ and uniformly distributed, and (d) follows by (29) and (28). We thus have a secrecy-leakage rate that tends to zero as $N\to\infty$ and $\epsilon\to 0$.

Privacy-leakage Rate: We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{N}I(X^N;M',S'+S|\tilde{\mathcal{C}})\\
&\overset{(a)}{=}\frac{1}{N}I(X^N;M'|\tilde{\mathcal{C}})\\
&\overset{(b)}{\leq}I(U;X)-I(U;Y)+\delta'+\delta'_\epsilon
\end{aligned}\tag{37}$$

where (a) follows since $S'+S$ is independent of $M'X^N\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$, and (b) follows by (31).

Storage Rate: We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{N}H(M',S'+S|\tilde{\mathcal{C}})&\overset{(a)}{\leq}R_m+\frac{1}{N}H(S'+S)\\
&\overset{(b)}{=}I(U;\widetilde{X})-I(U;Y)+\delta_1+I(U;Y)-\delta_2\\
&=I(U;\widetilde{X})+\delta_1-\delta_2
\end{aligned}\tag{38}$$

where (a) follows because $S'+S$ is independent of $M'\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$, and (b) follows by (25) and (26).

There thus exists a codebook for the chosen-secret model that achieves the key-leakage-storage triple

$$\begin{aligned}(R_s, R_l, R_m) = \big(&I(U,Y),\\ &I(U;X)-I(U;Y),\\ &I(U;\widetilde{X})\big).\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

APPENDIX C
CONVERSES

The converses are based on the steps in [3]. See also [1], [4], and [16].

A. Converse for Theorem 1

Suppose that for some $\epsilon>0$ and N there is an encoder and a decoder such that (2)-(6) are satisfied for the generated-secret model by the key-leakage-storage triple (R_s, R_l, R_m). Fano's inequality for S and $\hat{S}$ gives

$$H(S|MY^N) \le H(S|\hat{S}) \le N\epsilon_N \tag{40}$$

where $\epsilon_N = \epsilon R_s + H_b(\epsilon)/N$. Note that $\epsilon_N \to 0$ if $\epsilon \to 0$. We use (40) to bound the secret-key, privacy-leakage, and storage rates.

Secret-key rate: We have

$$\begin{aligned}
N(R_s-\epsilon) &\overset{(a)}{\le} H(S)\\
&= I(S;MY^N)+H(S|MY^N)\\
&\overset{(b)}{\le} I(S;M)+I(S;Y^N|M)+N\epsilon_N\\
&\overset{(c)}{\le} N\epsilon+H(Y^N|M)-H(Y^N|MS)+N\epsilon_N\\
&\le NH(Y)-\sum_{i=1}^{N} H(Y_i|MSY^{i-1})+N(\epsilon+\epsilon_N)\\
&\le NH(Y)-\sum_{i=1}^{N} H(Y_i|MSY^{i-1}X^{i-1})+N(\epsilon+\epsilon_N)\\
&\overset{(d)}{=} NH(Y)-\sum_{i=1}^{N} H(Y_i|MSX^{i-1})+N(\epsilon+\epsilon_N)
\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

where (a) follows by (5), (b) follows by (40), (c) follows by (3), and (d) follows because $Y^{i-1}-MSX^{i-1}-Y_i$ forms a Markov chain. In fact, we have

$$P_{Y^{i-1}Y_i|MSX^{i-1}} = P_{Y_i|MSX^{i-1}} \cdot P_{Y^{i-1}|X^{i-1}} \tag{42}$$

because $P_{Y|X}$ is a memoryless channel.

Identify $U_i = MSX^{i-1}$ in (41) so that $U_i - \widetilde{X}_i - X_i - Y_i$ forms a Markov chain, which follows since $P_{Y|X}$ and $P_{\widetilde{X}|X}$ are memoryless channels. Introduce a time-sharing random variable $Q \sim \text{Unif}[1:N]$ independent of other random variables. Define $X = X_Q$, $\widetilde{X} = \widetilde{X}_Q$, $Y = Y_Q$, and $U = (U_Q, Q)$ so that $U - \widetilde{X} - X - Y$ forms a Markov chain. Using (41) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
R_s &\le H(Y) - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{N} H(Y_i|U_i) + 2\epsilon + \epsilon_N\\
&= H(Y) - H(Y_Q|U_Q Q) + 2\epsilon + \epsilon_N\\
&= I(U;Y) + 2\epsilon + \epsilon_N.
\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

Storage rate: Consider

$$\begin{aligned}
N(R_m+\epsilon) &\overset{(a)}{\ge} H(M)\\
&\ge H(M|Y^N)\\
&\overset{(b)}{=} H(MSY^N) - H(Y^N) - H(S|MY^N) - H(MS|\widetilde{X}^N)\\
&= I(MS;\widetilde{X}^N) - I(MS;Y^N) - H(S|MY^N)\\
&\overset{(c)}{\ge} \Big[\sum_{i=1}^{N} I(MS\widetilde{X}^{i-1};\widetilde{X}_i) - I(MSY^{i-1};Y_i)\Big] - N\epsilon_N\\
&\overset{(d)}{\ge} \Big[\sum_{i=1}^{N} I(MSX^{i-1};\widetilde{X}_i) - I(MSX^{i-1};Y_i)\Big] - N\epsilon_N\\
&= \Big[\sum_{i=1}^{N} I(U_i;\widetilde{X}_i) - I(U_i;Y_i)\Big] - N\epsilon_N
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

where (a) follows by (6), (b) follows since $\widetilde{X}^N$ determines MS, (c) follows by (40) and because $\widetilde{X}^N$ and Y^N are i.i.d., and (d) follows by the Markov chains

$$Y^{i-1} - MSX^{i-1} - Y_i \tag{45a}$$

$$\widetilde{X}_i - MS\widetilde{X}^{i-1} - X^{i-1} \tag{45b}$$

where (45a) follows by (42), and (45b) by

$$P_{X^{i-1}\widetilde{X}_i|MS\widetilde{X}^{i-1}} = P_{\widetilde{X}_i|MS\widetilde{X}^{i-1}} \cdot P_{X^{i-1}|\widetilde{X}^{i-1}} \tag{46}$$

since $P_{\widetilde{X}|X}$ is a memoryless channel. Using the definition of U above, we obtain

$$R_m \ge I(U;\widetilde{X}) - I(U;Y) - (\epsilon+\epsilon_N). \tag{47}$$

Privacy-leakage rate: Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
N(R_l+\epsilon) &\overset{(a)}{\ge} I(X^N;M)\\
&\ge H(M|Y^N) - H(M|X^N)\\
&= H(MSY^N) - H(S|MY^N) - H(Y^N) - H(M|X^N)\\
&\ge I(MS;X^N) - I(MS;Y^N) - H(S|MY^N)\\
&\overset{(b)}{\ge} \Big[\sum_{i=1}^{N} I(MSX^{i-1};X_i) - I(MSY^{i-1};Y_i)\Big] - N\epsilon_N\\
&\overset{(c)}{\ge} \Big[\sum_{i=1}^{N} I(MSX^{i-1};X_i) - I(MSX^{i-1};Y_i)\Big] - N\epsilon_N\\
&= \Big[\sum_{i=1}^{N} I(U_i;X_i) - I(U_i;Y_i)\Big] - N\epsilon_N
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

where (a) follows by (4), (b) follows by (40), and (c) follows by (45a). Using the definition of U above, we have

$$R_l \geq I(U;X) - I(U;Y) - (\epsilon+\epsilon_N). \tag{49}$$

The converse for Theorem 1 follows by (43), (47), and (49), and by letting $\epsilon \to 0$.

B. Converse for Theorem 2

Suppose that for some $\epsilon > 0$ and N there is an encoder and a decoder such that (2)-(6) are satisfied for the chosen-secret model by the key-leakage-storage triple (R_s, R_l, R_m).

Secret-key rate: We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
N(R_s-\epsilon) &\overset{(a)}{\leq} H(S)\\
&= I(MS;Y^N)+I(S;M)+H(S|MY^N)-I(M;Y^N)\\
&\overset{(b)}{\leq} I(MS;Y^N) + N(\epsilon+\epsilon_N)\\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{N} I(MSY^{i-1};Y_i) + N(\epsilon+\epsilon_N)\\
&\overset{(c)}{\leq} \sum_{i=1}^{N} I(MSX^{i-1};Y_i) + N(\epsilon+\epsilon_N)\\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{N} I(U_i;Y_i) + N(\epsilon+\epsilon_N)
\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

where (a) follows by (5), (b) follows by (40) and (3), and (c) follows from the same steps as in (42). Using the definition of U given in the converse for Theorem 1, we obtain

$$R_s \leq I(U;Y) + 2\epsilon+\epsilon_N. \tag{51}$$

Storage rate: We have

$$\begin{aligned}
N(R_m+\epsilon) &\overset{(a)}{\geq} H(M)\\
&= I(MS;\widetilde{X}^N)-H(S|M)+H(MS|\widetilde{X}^N)\\
&\overset{(b)}{=} I(MS;\widetilde{X}^N)+I(S;M)\\
&\geq I(MS;\widetilde{X}^N)\\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{N} I(MS\widetilde{X}^{i-1};\widetilde{X}_i)\\
&\overset{(c)}{\geq} \sum_{i=1}^{N} I(MSX^{i-1};\widetilde{X}_i)\\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{N} I(U_i;\widetilde{X}_i)
\end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

where (a) follows by (6), (b) follows because S is independent of $\widetilde{X}^N$ and $\widetilde{X}^N S$ determines M, and (c) follows by applying the same steps as in (46). Using the definition of U above, we have

$$R_m \geq I(U;\widetilde{X}) - \epsilon. \tag{53}$$

Privacy-leakage rate: Consider

$$\begin{aligned}
N(R_l+\epsilon) &\overset{(a)}{\geq} I(X^N;M)\\
&= I(MS;X^N)-I(X^N;S|M)\\
&\geq I(MS;X^N)-H(S)\\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{N} I(MSX^{i-1};X_i) - H(S)\\
&\overset{(b)}{\geq} \Big[\sum_{i=1}^{N} I(U_i;X_i) - I(U_i;Y_i)\Big] - N(\epsilon+\epsilon_N)
\end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

where (a) follows by (4), and (b) follows by (50) that gives an upper bound on $H(S)$. Using the definition of U above, we obtain

$$R_l \geq I(U;X)-I(U;Y)-(2\epsilon+\epsilon_N). \tag{55}$$

The converse for Theorem 2 follows by (51), (53), and (55), and by letting $\epsilon \to 0$.

APPENDIX D
CARDINALITY BOUND FOR THE AUXILIARY RANDOM VARIABLE

Consider $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{|\mathcal{X}|}\}$ and the following $|\mathcal{X}|+2$ real-valued continuous functions on the connected compact subset $\mathcal{P}$ of all probability distributions on $\mathcal{X}$:

$$f_j(Q_X) = \begin{cases} Q_X(x_j) \text{ for } j = 1,2,\ldots,|\mathcal{X}|-1\\ H(X) \text{ for } j = |\mathcal{X}|\\ H(\widetilde{X}) \text{ for } j = |\mathcal{X}|+1\\ H(Y) \text{ for } j = |\mathcal{X}|+2. \end{cases} \tag{56}$$

By using the support lemma [17, Lemma 15.4] based on the results in [18] and [19], we find that there is a random variable U' taking at most $|\mathcal{X}|+2$ values such that Q_X, $H(X)$, $H(X|U)$, $H(\widetilde{X}|U)$, and $H(Y|U)$ are preserved if we replace U with U'. Since $P_{\widetilde{X}}(\tilde{x}) = \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} P_{\widetilde{X}|X}(\tilde{x}|x)Q_X(x)$ and $P_Y(y) = \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} P_{Y|X}(y|x)Q_X(x)$ the entropies $H(\widetilde{X})$ and $H(Y)$ are also preserved. Hence, the expressions

$$\begin{aligned}
&I(U;Y) = H(Y)-H(Y|U)\\
&I(U;X) - I(U;Y) = H(X)-H(X|U)-H(Y)+H(Y|U)\\
&I(U;\widetilde{X})-I(U;Y) = H(\widetilde{X})-H(\widetilde{X}|U)-H(Y)+H(Y|U)\\
&I(U;\widetilde{X}) = H(\widetilde{X})-H(\widetilde{X}|U)
\end{aligned}$$

are preserved by some U' with $|\mathcal{U}'| \leq |\mathcal{X}|+2$.

APPENDIX E
CONVEXITY OF $\mathcal{R}_1$ AND $\mathcal{R}_2$

Consider the rate region $\mathcal{R}_1$ and two random variables U_1 and U_2 such that $U_q - X - Y$ forms a Markov chain for $q = 1,2$. Define two key-leakage-storage triples $(R_{s_1}, R_{l_1}, R_{m_1})$ and $(R_{s_2}, R_{l_2}, R_{m_2})$ such that for $q = 1,2$

$$\begin{aligned}
R_{s_q} &\leq I(U_q;Y)\\
R_{l_q} &\geq I(U_q;X) - I(U_q;Y)\\
R_{m_q} &\geq I(U_q;\widetilde{X}) - I(U_q;Y)
\end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

so $(R_{s_q}, R_{l_q}, R_{m_q}) \in \mathcal{R}_1$. Let Q be a random variable that is independent of other random variables with $P_Q(1)=\alpha$ and $P_Q(2)=\bar{\alpha}$, where $\bar{\alpha}=1-\alpha$ and $0\leq\alpha\leq 1$. Define $U=(U_Q, Q)$ and the rates

$$\begin{aligned} R_s &= \alpha R_{s_1} + \bar{\alpha} R_{s_2} \\ R_l &= \alpha R_{l_1} + \bar{\alpha} R_{l_2} \\ R_m &= \alpha R_{m_1} + \bar{\alpha} R_{m_2}. \end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

We have

$$I(U;Y) = \alpha I(U_1;Y) + \bar{\alpha} I(U_2;Y) \geq R_s \tag{59}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &I(U;X) - I(U;Y) \\ &= \alpha(I(U_1;X) - I(U_1;Y)) + \bar{\alpha}(I(U_2;X) - I(U_2;Y)) \\ &\leq R_l \end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &I(U;\widetilde{X}) - I(U;Y) \\ &= \alpha(I(U_1;\widetilde{X}) - I(U_1;Y)) + \bar{\alpha}(I(U_2;\widetilde{X}) - I(U_2;Y)) \\ &\leq R_m. \end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

Observe that $U-\widetilde{X}-X-Y$ forms a Markov chain. We hence have $(R_s, R_l, R_m) \in \mathcal{R}_1$ for all $\alpha \in [0,1]$ so that the rate region $\mathcal{R}_1$ is convex. The proof of the convexity of $\mathcal{R}_2$ follows similarly.

REFERENCES

[1] R. Ahlswede and I. Csiszár, "Common randomness in information theory and cryptography - Part I: Secret sharing," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 1121–1132, July 1993.

[2] U. M. Maurer, "Secret key agreement by public discussion from common information," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 2733–742, May 1993.

[3] T. Ignatenko and F. M. J. Willems, "Biometric systems: Privacy and secrecy aspects," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Forensics and Security*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 956–973, Dec. 2009.

[4] L. Lai, S.-W. Ho, and H. V. Poor, "Privacy-security tradeoffs in biometric security systems," in *Allerton Conf. Comm., Control, and Comp.*, Urbana-Champaign, IL, USA, Sep. 2008, pp. 268–273.

[5] M. Koide and H. Yamamoto, "Coding theorems for biometric systems," in *IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory*, Austin, TX, USA, June 2010, pp. 2647–2651.

[6] O. Günlü, G. Kramer, and M. Skórski, "Privacy and secrecy with multiple measurements of physical and biometric identifiers," in *IEEE Int. Conf. Commun. and Network Sec.*, Florence, Italy, Sep. 2015, pp. 89–94.

[7] Y. Wang, S. Rane, S. C. Draper, and P. Ishwar, "A theoretical analysis of authentication, privacy, and reusability across secure biometric systems," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Forensics and Security*, vol. 7, no. 6, pp. 1825–1840, July 2012.

[8] A. D. Wyner and J. Ziv, "A theorem on the entropy of certain binary sequences and applications: Part I," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 19, no. 6, pp. 769–772, Nov. 1973.

[9] J. L. Massey, *Applied Digital Information Theory*. ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland, 1980-1998.

[10] A. Orlitsky and J. R. Roche, "Coding for computing," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 903–917, Mar. 2001.

[11] H. S. Witsenhausen, "Entropy inequalities for discrete channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 20, no. 5, pp. 610–616, Sep. 1974.

[12] R. Ahlswede and J. Körner, "On the connection between the entropies of input and output distributions of discrete memoryless channels," in *Proc. 5th Conf. Prob. Theory*, Braşov, Romania, Sep. 1974, pp. 13–22.

[13] O. Günlü and O. İşcan, "DCT based ring oscillator physical unclonable functions," in *IEEE Int. Conf. Acoust., Speech Sign. Proc.*, Florence, Italy, May 2014, pp. 8198–8201.

[14] A. E. Gamal and Y.-H. Kim, *Network Information Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.

[15] G. S. Vernam, "Cipher printing telegraph systems for secret wire and radio telegraphic communications," *Trans. Amer. Inst. Elect. Eng.*, vol. 45, pp. 295–301, Jan. 1926.

[16] I. Csiszár and P. Narayan, "Common randomness and secret key generation with a helper," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 344–366, Mar. 2000.

[17] I. Csiszár and J. Körner, *Information Theory: Coding Theorems for Discrete Memoryless Systems*, 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press, 2011.

[18] A. D. Wyner and J. Ziv, "The rate-distortion function for source coding with side information at the decoder," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 1–10, Jan. 1976.

[19] R. F. Ahlswede and J. Körner, "Source coding with side information and a converse for degraded broadcast channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 629–637, Nov. 1975.

[20] N. Chayat and S. Shamai, "Extension of an entropy property for binary input memoryless symmetric channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 35, no. 5, pp. 1077–1079, Sep. 1989.